



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/674,153

09/29/2003

Kuo-Huang Hsieh

MR3457-44

1903

4586

7590

02/12/2008

ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101

ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21043

EXAMINER

LIN, JAMES

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/12/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/674,153	Applicant(s) HSIEH ET AL.	
	Examiner Jimmy Lin	Art Unit 1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-7,9,11 and 14-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,10,12 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

The date indicating the signature of Pe-Zen Chang has been crossed out.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai (U.S. Patent 6,906,586) in view of Inganas et al. (WO 00/70406).

The rejection is cited in the Office Action filed 6/14/2007.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai '586 in view of Inganas '406 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0066978).

The rejection is cited in the Office Action filed 6/14/2007.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai '586 in view of Inganas '406 and Kim '978 as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0100566) and Aoki et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0039496).

The rejection is cited in the Office Action filed 6/14/2007.

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai '586 in view of Inganas '406 as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Pelrine et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0106314).

The rejection is cited in the Office Action filed 6/14/2007.

7. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai '586 in view of Inganas '406 as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Law et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0058067).

The rejection is cited in the Office Action filed 6/14/2007.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12/13/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim 1 as rejected over Sakurai and Inganas:

Applicant argues on pg. 4-5 that the ink fixation process of Inganas is *before* the pattern transferring process while the present claims require ink fixation *after* the pattern transferring process. However, Inganas teaches two different embodiments, wherein one embodiment is a lift-up method and the other is a put-down method. Figs. 1-3 are directed to the lift-up method and do not correspond to the embodiment cited in the rejection. The rejection cites the put-down method, which comprises the steps of applying a liquid deposition material onto the stamp and transferring the liquid deposition material to the substrate. The deposition process occurs over a finite period of time and the deposited material will necessarily evaporate at least slightly to thereby provide a fixation process *after* the pattern transferring process.

Claim 8 as rejected over Sakurai, Inganas, and Kim:

Applicant argues on pg. 5-6 that Kim does not teach a roller having at least one protruding body. However, the rejection is based on an Official Notice and Applicant has not properly traversed or challenged the factual assertion of the Office Notice. Thus, such common knowledge is taken to be admitted prior art because Applicant had failed to traverse Examiner's assertion (see MPEP 2144.03.C.).

Claim 10 as rejected over Sakurai, Inganas, Kim, Lee, and Aoki:

Applicant argues on pg. 6-8 that the teachings of Lee and Aoki are reasonably pertinent to the accumulation of elements from the cited sources. However, Lee and Aoki reasonably suggest the level of ordinary skill and knowledge in the field of transferring a pattern using rollers at the time the present invention was filed. One of ordinary skill would have recognized that the teachings of Lee and Aoki could have been reasonably applied to deposition processes using a roller as the particular deposition apparatus.

Applicant argues on pg. 8 that there is nothing in Aoki about how ink would spread onto the foam roller by capillarity due to the porosity of foam type materials. However, such a phenomenon would necessarily occur because the porous structure of a foam roller would necessarily take up a liquid through capillary action.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-8902. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy H Meeks/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Jimmy Lin/
Examiner, Art Unit 1792